

AUGUST, 1860.

No. 3.

PRICE 5 CENTS.

THE dHC
REPUBLICAN POCKET PISTOL,

A COLLECTION OF

Facts, Opinions and Arguments

FOR

FREEDOM.

EDITED BY

WILLIAM H. BURLEIGH, ESQ.

NEW-YORK:

H. DAYTON, PUBLISHER,

No. 36 HOWARD-STREET.

1860.

FACTS FOR THE PEOPLE.

THE

REPUBLICAN POCKET-PISTOL

A COLLECTION OF

Facts, Opinions and Arguments
FOR FREEDOM.

EDITED BY WM. H. BURLEIGH, ESQ.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY DURING THE CAMPAIGN, COMMENCING JUNE 5th

36 PAGES, 18mo. PRICE 5 CENTS.

The object of this work will be to present in the most compact and practicable form the principles and aims of the Republican party, the issues involved in its contest with the Slave Power, and its Democratic allies; the sentiments of the leading statesmen of the country, past and present, in reference to those issues, and such other matters of interest as may be evolved in the progress of the political struggle upon which we have entered. What every working Republican will desire, in the way of fact, argument, and opinion, for himself and for his neighbor, to inform the ignorant, convince the prejudiced, and stimulate the lukewarm, will be given in this POCKET-PISTOL series, in a form at once compact, neat, and convenient, and at a price which will enable our Republican Clubs to put a copy into the hands of every voter who can read.

The Republican Pocket-Pistol will be published on the 5th of June each month during the Campaign.

Single copies of any number will be sent by mail on receipt of 5 cents. For 25 cents it will be mailed to subscribers during the Campaign.

5 COPIES TO ONE ADDRESS, FOR \$1 00.

We trust our Republican friends in all parts of the country, will exert themselves to make up clubs for the POCKET-PISTOL. It will give you a complete outfit of fact and argument with which to combat the sham Democracy.

Address

H. DAYTON, Publisher,

36 Howard-St., N.Y.

THE
REPUBLICAN POCKET PISTOL,

A COLLECTION OF

Facts, Opinions, and Arguments

FOR FREEDOM.

EDITED BY

WILLIAM H. BURLEIGH.



NEW-YORK:

H. DAYTON, PUBLISHER,

No. 36 HOWARD STREET.

1860.

Entered; according to Act of Congress; in the year 1860, by

H. DAYTON,

at the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States
for the Southern District of New-York.

THE
Republican Pocket Pistol.

AUGUST, 1860.

“SECTIONALISM.”

No charge is more persistently urged against the Republican party than that of “sectionalism.” It constitutes the warp and woof of innumerable congressional and stump speeches uttered by the partisans of the Slave Power—it is incorporated into the resolutions of (so-called) Democratic Conventions—and all possible changes are rung upon it, through the wearying and repetitious columns of a thousand democratic newspapers. What do they all mean by it?—if, indeed, they mean anything beyond exciting the terrors of the ignorant, by the use of a word to which they attach no very definite meaning, but which serves as a sort of verbal *bugaboo*, whose very mistiness of outline may give to the uninitiated an intimation of something terrible.

What do they mean?

If our accusers mean to affirm that the Republican Party aims to promote the interests of one section of the country, to the neglect, or at the expense, of the interests of another section—or, that we ignore *national* interests or ideas, in our devotion to those that are *local* in their character and influence—or that our policy is partial rather than general in its character, we interpose our emphatic denial, and call upon them for the proof.

Whose Fault is it?

If they simply mean that our organization is not co-extensive with the States; that it is, mainly, confined to sections where the rights of the laborer are respected, and *men*, created in the image of God, are not “deemed, taken, and held as *chattels* personal,” or herded with sheep and swine as mere marketable commodities; then we submit the shame and the blame, if any there be, rest not on us, but on those who would sacrifice the greater interests to the less—who adhere to local prejudices at the expense of National ideas. For, manifestly, it is not our fault if South Carolina repudiates the principles which are broadly American, in her blind adherence to those narrow prejudices which she

absurdly regards as principles, but which no more deserve the name than the fetichism of Congo deserves the name of Christianity. If, by lawless violence, or, still worse, by a base prostitution of the forms of law, the men of the South who accept the faith of their Revolutionary fathers, are not permitted to give expression to that faith, by speech, or press, or in political organization, it does not prove that Washington and Jefferson, that Madison and Monroe, that Benton and Clay, were sectionalists; though it is undeniable that these men, in relation to the question of slavery extension, held substantially the same position as that occupied by the Republican party of to-day. And if holding this position did not render *them* sectional, neither does *our* holding it render *us* so. If our principles and policy are National, their rejection by this section, or by that, cannot change their character. And whether they are so or not, depends not upon their acceptance or rejection, by this or by that clique, by this or by that State. Because some isolated atheist may blab his blasphemies in the face of the Sun, it does not follow that Christianity is no longer the faith of Christendom! still less that it is not adapted to the needs of universal humanity.

The Nationality of Republicanism.

It is a question both of adaptation and of fact. If its principles harmonize with the National Idea, then so far is the party National; if its policy is adapted to the true interests of every section, then so far again is the party National. We affirm that such is the fact. If, failing to perceive this, any section of our country should, by unconstitutional means, exclude our organization from its limits, time will soon rectify the wrong. In fact, our organization is rapidly extending to the slaveholding States, and before President Lincoln's term of office has expired, our party affiliations will reach every county and township and hamlet throughout the South.

Our Distinctive National Idea.

What is it?—That idea which gave us a national existence, and separated us as widely, in our polity and our influence, from other governments as we were separated from the kingdoms of the Old World by the ocean that rolled between us? It is—LIBERTY. Liberty, the universal right—not made contingent on birth, or condition—not the gift of kings, or potentates, of charters or of constitutions, but

inherent in, and proved by the fact of, *humanity*. That all men are created equal—that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights—that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, were held as self-evident truths by those who built, on these firm foundation stones, the structure of our Nationality. To say that our fathers did not mean what they solemnly affirmed, is to charge them with hypocrisy, which is no less a *cowardice* than it is a *vice*. They *did* mean it—they *did* believe it—and it is everlastingly *true*. From this truth, they derived, logically, that other truth—“That all just governments are derived from the consent of the governed:” another form of expressing our great National Idea.

The Sincerity of our Fathers.

Slavery, indeed, existed in the land, and some of our earlier statesmen were implicated in it; but this fact, though it may subject them to the charge of inconsistency, does not prove their insincerity. They themselves admitted and deplored the inconsistency; but, so far from restricting or modifying their great principle to conform it to an anomalous practice, they acknowledged that such practice *was* anomalous,

and avowed their belief that it must gradually die out, and finally become obsolete under the influence of their principle. In this faith, they jealously excluded from the Constitution all recognition of slaves as *property*, and, in fact, everything that could warrant the belief, to future generations, that such an institution ever had an existence in a land so solemnly consecrated to freedom. To this end they decreed the early suppression of the foreign Slave Trade, thus, as they supposed, cutting off the fountain of supply; and to this end, also, they guarded by legislative enactments every inch of the National Domain from the introduction of the accursed system. Believing that, under the operation of liberal principles, it was in the course of extinction in all the States, they naturally thought that nothing more was needed to free us entirely from its presence than the suppression of the most obvious source of supply, and its restriction from all the territories of the Union.

We do not state this simply as an inference from the acts referred to, but as the interpretation given to these acts by the actors themselves. The debates of the Convention that framed the Constitution, reported by Mr. Madison, furnish

conclusive evidence on this point, as do also the writings of Jefferson, Hamilton, Jay, and their contemporaries.

A Modern Discovery.

The doctrine that the Constitution, by its own force, carries Slavery with it wherever it goes, is one of very recent discovery, and its annunciation could astonish no one more than the framers of that instrument. They evidently never even deemed that audacity itself could make such a preposterous claim. On the contrary, they regarded Slavery as a local interest, merely, exceptional in its character, and having no existence beyond the jurisdiction of the local law. They made LIBERTY our great National Interest, as it was distinctively our great National Idea; while Slavery was regarded as sectional, anomalous, restricted in its influence, and temporary in its duration.

"The Old Paths."

The Republican party of to-day stands, in relation to this question, precisely where Washington, and Jefferson, and Madison, and their contemporary statesmen, stood. They regarded Slavery as a contradiction of the foundation principles of our Government. So does the Re-

publican party. They considered it as a local, exceptional, and temporary interest merely. So does the Republican party. They zealously labored, and judiciously legislated to exclude it forever from all the public domain. To this end the Republican party labors and legislates. They laid the foundations of the Government in Liberty, as the faith, the hope, and the interest of the Nation. The Republican party seeks to build, on that foundation, a superstructure which the world shall recognize as the completed idea of its originators, and as the worthiest illustration of their principles.

“An Old World Barbarism.”

It is well, too, to remember, in this connection, that Slavery is not an outgrowth of American ideas. It is an Old-World barbarism, and the most illiberal, anti-democratic, un-American of all institutions. If it can be justified for a single hour, there is no despotism that ever crushed humanity that need go begging for defenders. It is deplorable that it should exist anywhere—it is intolerable that the great interests of Labor should be sacrificed, and, still worse, the honor of a Nation compromised, by its indefinite extension over territory, the property of the Nation, and “whose normal condition is that of free-

dom." To ask the people of the North to consent to any such prostitution is simply to ask them to repudiate the principles and the policy of the fathers and to nationalize an institution which is foreign to the American idea, antagonistic to all human progress, an outrage upon the rights of labor, and an insult to the laborer, and which, a usurpation everywhere, is doubly a usurpation when it overleaps the bounds of State jurisdiction, where it can claim the dubious sanction of pirate law, and seizes as its own the vast domains which, by the solemn act of the nation, were once set apart as the inalienable inheritance of Freedom.

The Real Sectionalists.

Because we accept, as just and wise, the policy of Washington and Jefferson, we must still maintain our *National Idea* against the party with the duplicated head, that would subordinate it to the *sectionalism of Slavery*. Because we are friends of the Union and of the Constitution we deprecate the extension of the only influence that ever imperilled the one, and we would hurl from power the men who, by false interpretations and audacious assumptions, have perverted and well nigh destroyed the other. We are national as

the statesmen of our earlier day were national—because our principles and our policy in reference to slavery extension are identical with theirs. *They* are sectional who would sacrifice the interests of millions of free laborers to subserve the supposed interests of a mere handful of men, claiming the right to compel labor while withholding wages. *They* are sectional, who assert for a barbarism that ignores every principle that underlies our civil polity, a pre-eminence over every institution that freedom has planted in the land, for the benefit of the many and for its own perpetuity. In one word, the Slavery Propaganda—whether singing hosannas to Douglas, or shouting itself hoarse for Breckinridge, in its effort to nationalize an institution which contradicts the fundamental principles of our government, which is foreign in its origin, which is the creature of local law, unless, indeed, it be absolutely lawless, and which is hostile to every interest of the North, and no less hostile to every legitimate interest of the South, the Slavery Propaganda, with its confederates and its dupes, are the real *sectionalists*, as not a few of them are avowed *disunionists*; while the Republican party is alike national, Union-loving, conservative, true to the Constitution, and, therefore, protesting against the interpolation into it of novel and despotic doc-

trines—true to the faith of the founders of our nation, and, therefore, maintaining that LIBERTY IS OUR NATIONAL IDEA, AND NO LESS OUR NATIONAL INTEREST.

FOUNDATION PRINCIPLES ASSAILED.

There was a time, not far back in our history, when a denial of the central truth of our Declaration of Independence would have been received with amazement and indignation, and regarded as evidence that the denier was hostile to free governments, and an advocate of despotism. But all this has been bravely changed in the progress of the (so-called) Democratic party Slavery-ward. It was an evil day for the country, and no less an evil day for the party, when the latter gave itself up to the control of the Slave Power, and pledged obedience to its behests: for such obedience involved the necessity of an entire change in its political philosophy. The old dogma of “the divine right of kings,” which our fathers had made a thing of scorn, substituting for it the divine rights of humanity, was revived again, with a difference—and now stands in the political text-book of our sham democracy, as the divine right of slavery. The repudiation of the doctrines of the Revolution, a bold and shame-

less denial of the self-evident truth that "all men are endowed with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," became a necessity of their position. With what face could they aid the usurpations of slavery, and consent to all its monstrous claims, while pretending to accept the faith of Washington and Jefferson? Such self-stultification was too much for even our modern democracy. They must either deny that faith, or oppose the nationalizing of slavery. They chose the former, for in the latter direction they saw the honors and emoluments of political power. So, some of them boldly denied "the self-evident truths," and others attempted to explain them away. Mr. Rufus Choate called them "glittering generalities." Mr. George Fitzhugh, with sesquipedalian eloquence, asseverates that "the Declaration of Independence is exuberantly false and arborescently fallacious." Another distinguished democrat calls it "a rhetorical flourish," another, "Mr. Jefferson's unfortunate legacy," and still another, with refreshing directness of speech, "a self-evident lie." The Hon. Caleb Cushing, the President of two National Democratic Conventions in this year of grace, 1860—ventures the opinion that "all men are *not* born free and

equal"—though it would be difficult for even a greater casuist than he, to frame an argument for his own right of liberty that did not equally establish the right of all. Yet to-day, probably, a majority of (so-called) democrats deny the faith of our Revolutionary fathers, and in its stead accept the doctrines of despotism.

To What End.

Nothing can be more certain than that the general repudiation of this faith must be followed by a corresponding revival of despotic dogmas and practices—the oppression of the weak by the strong—the subjugation of the many to the few—the practical denial that “governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed,” and the gradual restriction of the franchises of the people. The tendency of the lying ethics which the Slavery Propaganda would substitute for the sublime truths of the Declaration, is to these results—if they are not ultimately reached, it will be because that tendency is seen in time, and sternly resisted by a liberty-loving people.

The Douglas Interprets It.

Among those who have attempted to give a restricted meaning to our sublime Charter of

Freedom, and so interpret it that its old significance shall be for ever lost, is Stephen A. Douglas. Says he :

“No man can vindicate the character, the motives, and the conduct of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, except upon the hypothesis that they referred to the white race alone, and not to the African, when they declared all men to have been created free and equal—that they were speaking of British subjects on this continent being equal to British subjects born and residing in Great Britain—that they were entitled to the same inalienable rights, and among them were enumerated life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The Declaration of Independence was adopted merely for the purpose of justifying the colonists in the eyes of the civilized world in withdrawing their allegiance from the British crown, and dissolving their connection with the mother-country.”

Such an “hypothesis,” so far from *vindicating* “the character, the motives, and the conduct of the signers of the Declaration of Independence,” strips them at once of every claim to our respect, and presents them to the world as pitiful tricksters, “paltering in a double sense,” and crowning the wickedness of mendacity by the cowardice of hypocrisy. It is significant of Mr. Douglas’s own standard of honor, that he could even

suggest such an hypothesis. Fortunately for the signers of the Declaration, they did not leave either the explanation of their purpose or the vindication of their motives to any theory that the necessities of despotism might subsequently invent, but they put on record, in act and in word, the most convincing testimony that they meant just what they have been universally understood to mean, till Mr. Douglas made the brilliant discovery that they really meant nothing of the sort. By "*all men*," they understood a very inconsiderable minority of the human race, viz., the *whites*: nay, a very inconsiderable minority of the whites themselves, viz., British subjects, intending simply to affirm that "British subjects here are equal to British subjects in Great Britain!" Oh, most lame and impotent conclusion! Let us see how the Declaration of Independence, revised and corrected by Stephen A. Douglas, would read:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all white men are created equal, or, at least, that British subjects on this continent are equal to British subjects born or residing in Great Britain, and are entitled to the same inalienable rights among which are life, liberty (of a dubious sort) and the pursuit of happiness."

Such an emasculation of the glorious meanings of this document would be ludicrous, were it not attempted in the service of a mean and cruel despotism. Perhaps Mr. Douglas's success in translating Jefferson's immortal document into the vernacular of Slavedom, may encourage him to do a similar work for certain parts of the Bible, that, as they now read, have a rebuking tone to all those who "rob the poor, because he is poor, and oppress the afflicted in the gate."

The Old Faith Maintained.

Our greatest national historian, Mr. Bancroft, has not yet come into the light of Mr. Douglas's great discovery. He is still a disciple of the old faith, that the Declaration means all that it affirms, and that its grandest affirmation is its grandest truth. Referring to it, he says: "The Bill of Rights which it promulgates, is of rights that are older than human institutions, and springs from the eternal justice which is anterior to the State. . . . Two political theories," he continues, "divided the world; one founded the Commonwealth on the reasons of state, the policy of expediency; the other on the immutable principles of morals: the new Republic, as it took its place among the powers of the world,

proclaimed its faith in the truth and reality, and unchangeableness of freedom, virtue, right. The heart of Jefferson, in writing the Declaration, and of Congress in adopting it, beat for all humanity ; the assertion of right was made for the entire world of mankind, and all coming generations, without any exception whatever ; for the proposition which admits of exception, can never be self-evident."

No one will question Mr. Bancroft's familiarity with all questions involved in the history of our confederacy ; and few, we think, will hesitate to accept *his* interpretation, rather than that of Mr. Douglas, of the *intent* of the passage in the Declaration referred to. But even were our fathers the paltry, huckstering knaves and hypocrites that the "hypothesis" of Mr. Douglas would make them, it would still remain true, while the peopled earth endures, "that all men are born equal : that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights : that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness ; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

FREE MEN—FREE SPEECH—FREE TERRITORIES.

The freedom of speech and of the press is one of the most formidable barriers to tyranny, and it is doubtless the most potent conservator of the rights of the people. Strike this down, and the work of the despot in the subjugation of the masses is already more than half accomplished. Where this exists no despotism, how strongly soever it may be walled about by bayonets, can for a single hour be considered secure. It is no marvel, then, that when some infernal atrocity is contemplated against the liberties of the people, that almost the first blow struck is against free speech and a free press. No wonder that throughout the entire domain of Slavedom, neither freedom of speech nor of the press is tolerated, but a mean system of espionage is established over every one suspected of a regard for "the sacred rights of human nature." The despotism of self-constituted vigilance committees is substituted for law, and every petty postmaster is converted into a petty thief, whose business is to plunder the mails which he is specially sworn to protect. The excuse for all this is, that Slavery and a free press are incompatible. True, and for this reason, we contend that Slavery and Freedom *can-*

not, in the very nature of the case, be joint occupants of any territory.

Douglas Means to Put "Them Down."

Freedom of speech and of the press is one of our Constitution-guarded rights ; but, notwithstanding this, efforts have been made from time to time by Northern politicians, who thus sought to ingratiate themselves with the Slave power, to "*put down*" free discussion by the strong arm of law whenever it ventured to question the divinity of Slavery. Prominent among those who have assailed this Constitutional right stands Stephen A. Douglas, who is now stumping the Northern States as a candidate for the Presidency. During the last session of Congress he introduced and advocated a bill, in his place in the Senate, striking directly at the freedom of speech and the press, under the plea that it was necessary to suppress sectional warfare against Slavery. His blow was evidently aimed at the Republican party, and he might have thought it a master-stroke of policy to thus legislate his opponents out of the ring, and so stride forward to take the Presidential prize without making any serious competition. In his speech upon the introduction of his new "Sedition Law," he said :

"Mr. President, the mode of preserving

peace is plain. This system of sectional warfare must cease. The Constitution has given the power, and all we ask of Congress is to give us the means, and we, *by indictments and convictions in the federal courts of the several States, will make such examples of the leaders of these conspiracies as will strike terror into the hearts of the others, and there will be an end of this crusade.* The great principle that underlies the organization of the Republican party is violent, irreconcilable, eternal warfare upon the institution of American Slavery, with a view to its ultimate extinction throughout the land. Sir, I confess the object of the legislation I contemplate is to PUT DOWN this outside interference ; *it is to repress the 'irrepressible conflict.'* ”

That there might be no misapprehension of the intent and purpose of Mr. Douglas, Senator Harlan, of Iowa proposed, as an amendment, the following proviso to the bill :

“ But the free discussion of the morality and expediency of Slavery should never be interfered with by the laws of any State or the United States ; *and the freedom of speech and of the press, on this and every subject of domestic and national policy, shall be maintained inviolate in all the States.* ”

This amendment was *rejected* ! Mr. Douglas and the Democratic majority voting solidly

against it, while all the Republicans present, true to the letter and spirit of the Constitution, voted affirmatively. This attempt to enact a new Sedition Law—a law to coerce opinion and to deny the liberty of speech and the press, and thus practically to abrogate one of the most precious guarantees of the Constitution—had not even the poor excuse in its favor which the friends of the old Sedition law urged in its behalf—that it was in defence of Free Government against the capacious and libellous assaults of those who sought to bring it into contempt. Mr. Douglas's law, equally harsh in its provisions and no less abhorrent to the Constitution, had for its object the defence and perpetuation of Slavery, the deadliest foe of the rights and interests of the laboring man everywhere. No other comment upon this attempt can be needed to show its shameless antagonism to the cherished policy of the nation, than that which is contained in Article I. of the amendments to the Constitution, which is as follows :

“Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.”

THE GREAT BUGABOO.

The slave power believes in intimidation. It enforces the obedience of its *bondsmen* by it, North and South. Its plantation overseers crack the whip over the gangs of the latter, and political alarmists and demagogues perform a similar office to secure the allegiance of the former, lest some rebellious voter should be seized with a fugacious impulse and escape from the oligarchy to whom his service or labor is due. In fact, it has reduced intimidation to a system, quite as much in reference to the Northern voter as to the Southern slave. It is thus made an element of power, as calculable in their estimates of influence as either money, or official patronage, or oratorical talent, or a capacity for political intrigue.

Predicating their hopes of success in this direction upon the well-known attachment to the Union which characterizes the citizens of the free States, they become blatant and vociferous with threats of dissolution whenever they see any indications that power is slipping from their grasp and that the people are seriously intent upon bringing back the government to the policy of its founders. "If you do this, or that, or the other thing, which agrees not with our own pre-

judices *we'll dissolve the Union.*" This is their stereotyped threat—their great *bugaboo*. For a quarter of a century, at least, they have resorted to it, and it must be confessed, to our shame, with very considerable success. To appease this cry Northern statesmen have suppressed their honest convictions, Northern merchants have packed up their principles with their bales and sold both together to their Southern customers, and Northern legislatures have modified their policy, sometimes to the sacrifice of large pecuniary interests, and still oftener to the sacrifice of their convictions of right and their self respect.

Its Use Against Fremont.

Not to go farther back, most of our readers will remember how vociferous and persistent was this threat in 1856, during the Presidential candidacy of Mr. Fremont. Not only Southern fire-eaters, but almost all the orators and presses in the service of the sham-Democracy uttered the treasonable cry, either as a prophecy or a threat, and in either case for purposes of intimidation. From Toombs, of Georgia, came a doleful sound :

"If Fremont is elected the Union would be dissolved, and ought to be dissolved !"

Senator Butler, of South Carolina, said :

“When Fremont is elected we must rely upon what we have—a good State government. Every governor of the South should call the legislature of his State together, and have measures of the South decided upon. *If they did not, and submit to the degradation, they would deserve the fate of slaves. I should advise my Legislature to go at the tap of the drum.*”

Mr. Keitt of South Carolina, with his accustomed vehemence, in one of his political harangues, declared :

“I tell you now, that if Fremont is elected, *adherence to the Union is treason to liberty.* I tell you now, that the Southern man who will submit to his election is a *traitor and a coward.*”

Preston S. Brooks of the same State, better known as Bully Brooks, from his cowardly assault upon Mr. Sumner, in an address to his constituents, said :

“We have the issue upon us now ; and how are we to meet it? I tell you, fellow-citizens, from the bottom of my heart, that the only mode which I think available for meeting it, *is just to tear the Constitution of the United States, trample it under foot, and form a Southern Confederacy, every State of which will be a slaveholding State.* I believe it, as I stand in the face of my Maker ; I believe it on my responsibility to you as your honored representative, that *the only hope of the*

South is in the South, and that the only available means of making that hope effective is to cut asunder the bonds that tie us together, and take our separate position in the family of nations. These are my opinions. 'They have always been my opinions. I have been a disunionist from the time I could think.

"I speak on my individual responsibility. If Fremont be elected President of the United States I am for the people in their majesty rising above the law and leaders, taking the power in their own hands, going by concert or not by concert, and laying the strong arm of Southern freemen upon the treasury and archives of the government."

Henry A. Wise said to the people of Virginia :

"If you submit to the election of Fremont, you will prove what Seward and Burlingame said to be true,⁴ that 'the South cannot be kicked out of the Union.'"

Said the "Richmond Enquirer :"

"If Fremont is elected, the Union will not last one hour after Mr. Pierce's term expires . . . If Fremont is elected it will be the duty of the South to dissolve the Union and form a Southern Confederacy."

These are but specimens; we could give thousands of a similar character, from members of Congress, governors, political orators, and editors, who thus endeavored to *frighten* the people of the North and West from the support of Fre-

mont—for it should not be forgotten that *all of these utterances were designed for the people of the non-slaveholding States*. It was the crack of the overseer's lash for the slave-gangs on his Northern plantations.

Well, Fremont was defeated—not, however, through fears engendered by these threats, but through the stupendous and now *proven* frauds by which Pennsylvania was carried for the Democratic State ticket in the October election. *That* decided the contest, and Buchanan was the consequence.

The Experiment Repeated.

Now the old threat swells on the air again, and increases in vehemence as the election of Mr. Lincoln becomes more imminent. Dissolution! shout the fire-eaters of the South, and their Northern allies echo the cry in a sort of alarmed and shivering tone, that might induce a few simple folk to put faith in its sincerity. It is the old *bugaboo* on its quaternial round of intimidation, and as it is currently reported that the “fools are not all dead,” it is likely enough to meet with some success in that direction. We do not think it will be a very brilliant one, however, nor yield a large revenue of votes to the bankrupt politicians who have invested their capital in this enterprise.

Three Things that it is Like.

The gasconade about "dissolving the Union" reminds one—

Of the indignant hod-carrier, who was being drawn to the top of a five-story building, by means of a basket and a rope. The stout arms above were either too slow or too fast in their movements, and the choleric gentleman in the basket whipped out his jack-knife, opened it, and swore a big oath that "if the spalpeens above him did not manage matters more satisfactorily, faith he'd *cut the rope!*"—

Or of a zealous arborist, pruning his trees, seated on the topmost branch of a noble sycamore, and sawing off the limb that supports him, just between himself and the main trunk—

Or of a company of paupers, grumbling over their daily rations, and with an emphasis worthy of the Hon. Jefferson Davis, or the chivalrous Yancey himself, pronouncing their "*Be it Resolved*, That unless our biscuits are more bountifully buttered, we will withdraw our patronage from the Commissioners of the Alms House!"

The Real Danger.

We urge nothing against the sincerity of the disunionists, but willingly accept it at their own

estimate. Some of them, probably, mean what they say. But *talk* is cheap, and must translate itself into overt acts, before the law dignifies their folly with the name of treason. When that time comes, if it ever should, the conservatism of the South itself, will put its foot on it and crush it. Had these threats of secession been treated from the first with the contempt which they deserve, they could never have had any significance. Their power for mischief consists simply in the fact that some timid souls in the North have been frightened by them, and in their haste to avert a fancied peril, have to some extent made it a real one. Every concession to this bluster is, in fact, a premium offered for its continuance. Why *shouldn't* the fire-eaters persist in it while it yields them the power which they covet, through the cowardice which they despise? The result is an increasingly insolent tone on their part, with every concession on ours; and so the spirit of overseership grows by what it feeds on. But there must be a point beyond which Northern pusillanimity will not go, and when that is reached it may be found that the Southern secessionists have so far compromised themselves by pledges, that they will be precipitated into overt acts; or that, by frequent

repetition of their stereotyped threat, they have absolutely convinced themselves that it is right and feasible to put their treasonable words into treasonable deeds ; and so they may bring their necks within the compass of a hempen noose, partly through their own folly, and partly through that timid, compromising, falsely conservative spirit at the North, which has stimulated the fanaticism of the South by a suicidal submission to its demands. The very crisis which our professional Union-savers affect to fear, will thus be brought upon us, if at all, by the policy which they pursue. But, on the other hand, let these threats of disunion be met with a calm front by the people of the North ; let it be seen that they have no terror for us, and are utterly powerless to swerve us one hair's-breadth from our impregnable constitutional position, and the Keitts and Quattlebums, the Yanceys and the Crawfords, will subside, and their gasconade with them. We charge, therefore, upon our professional Union-savers, whether the alarm which they exhibit is affected or real, whether their zeal is stimulated by patriotism or the hope of public plunder, that, practically, they are giving to disunionism all the vitality it possesses, and, if it shall ever be-

come formidable, it will be so only through their cowardly concessions or their guilty complicity.

Democratic Coercion.

Politically, who are they who seek to profit by this cry of disunion? For the most part, they are the leaders of the Democratic party, and they do what they can to intensify the disunion spirit and to stimulate its manifestation. It is a dangerous game which they are playing at, and one that may yet turn to plague its inventors. See, too, the contingency upon which disunion is made to depend—the election of a Republican President! This was the burden of a hundred Congressional speeches last winter, nearly all of which were from so-called Democrats, and is still the burden of the Democratic orators and editors of every name. What is this but the most insolent dictation? — a flagitious attempt to *coerce* the suffrages of independent citizens? But in what respect is *coercion* better than *bribery*?—the attempt to *drive* the voter than the attempt to *buy* him? The man who will be either bought or driven is a slave in soul, from whom the franchise of the freeman should be religiously withheld. Yet we are insolently denied our constitutional right of choice—are told that if we elect the man whom

we honestly believe the truest representative of the government which our fathers framed and of the policy which they adopted, the minority will secede, dissolve the Union, and establish a separate confederacy ! This is to be the penalty of the assertion on our part of our constitutional rights—of the faithful and conscientious discharge of an obligation imposed upon us by the fact of citizenship ! Why, if this be so, of what value to us is the elective franchise ? It exists no longer. We are the subjects of a despotism that makes our votes not the expression of our individual convictions, but the instruments of its own arbitrary will. Out upon the tyrannous assumption ! If this is the price to be paid for the preservation of the Union, we must decline the speculation. The returns do not justify the investment of so large a capital.

The Right is the Expedient.

No, it is not by such a base surrender of our convictions that this Union is to be preserved. There is peril in all such concessions. The path of honor is likewise the path of safety. The blatant threats of secession will never cease so long as Northern freemen cower before them. Defy them, treat them with the scorn which they deserve, and they will insult us no more.

Free Laborers and Mechanics look at This!

That slavery necessarily comes into competition with free labor, to the injurious depression of the latter, and that the interests of our entire laboring population are thus adversely affected, are propositions so manifestly true that they require no argument for their demonstration. This destructive competition must, of course, extend with the extension of slavery. The proposition, therefore, to give it free ingress to all our Territories is simply a proposition to subject our free laborers and mechanics to competition with slave labor, and so bring their wages down to the minimum required for the support of a slave. It is for *them* to say how they like it, and whether they are ready to sacrifice not their own interests merely but those of their children and children's children to the latest generation, that they may give new strength, and wider dominion, and perpetuity of power to slavery.

Here is an illustrative fact of more significance than volumes of speculative theory. The president of the Tennessee and Alabama Railroad Company some time since urged the company to *buy* its laborers instead of hiring them. His plan included the purchase of common laborers and mechanics for the road, and farm hands

to stock a farm to be rented for the purpose of supplying provisions for the railroad laborers. A portion of these were to be in families, in order that the natural increase might supply the natural waste. He thus demonstrates, mathematically, the superiority of his plan over that of *hiring* negroes, and it would be still more marked in its economical aspects over that of hiring free white laborers :

“The average hire of negro men to work on internal improvements in this country is about \$175. If the company were to purchase at the present prices, say \$1,000, the yearly cost to the company, compared with the hirelings, will be as follows :

Interest on \$1,000	\$60
Insurance.....	15
<hr/>	
Total	\$75

Which is three sevenths—less than half—for a hand to be employed in grading or excavating earth, besides the profit to the contractor. But upon mechanical work a still greater difference exists. Take masonry, for example, of which there will have to be a large amount done. A sprightly negro man will, in six months, make a tolerable mason, and in twelve months a good one; for it is a simple trade, easily learned. Generally, masons are scarce, and demand a high price; and a contractor offering for work bases his calculation upon paying these high prices.

“The cost to a company owning slaves who are masons, and to contractors who hire them, will approximate to the following calculations :

Interest on \$1,000.....	\$60
Insurance on life.....	15
Clothing, &c.....	15
200 lbs. of bacon.....	15
Three barrels of corn and vegetables.....	10
Total.....	<u>\$115</u> ”

It only needs that our Territories be thrown wide open to slavery, and the free homestead principle be voted down in Congress, or vetoed by a pro-slavery President, to give our Northern laborers and mechanics the full benefit of this competition with slave labor.

Will be Published June 10th,

THE REPUBLICAN CAMPAIGN SONGSTER.

EDITED BY WILLIAM H. BURLEIGH, Esq.

72 PAGES, 18mo. PRICE, 10 CENTS.

~~~~~

Mr. Burleigh is well known to the public, and his name is a sufficient guaranty that his work will be well done.

NO REPUBLICAN CLUB CAN AFFORD TO DO WITHOUT IT.

## PRICES.

|                 |               |
|-----------------|---------------|
| Per COPY,.....  | \$0 10 Cents. |
| " DOZEN.....    | 1 00.         |
| " HUNDRED.....  | 7 00.         |
| " THOUSAND..... | 60 00.        |

Single copies will be sent by mail, postage paid, on receipt of Ten cents, but where larger quantities are ordered at the reduced price, they must be sent by express, or some other way than by mail.

First edition of 25,000 ready on the 10th of June.—  
Send orders immediately, to

**H. DAYTON, Publisher,**

**No. 36 Howard-Street,**

**NEW-YORK.**



**BUY THE CORRECT EDITION.**

---

**THE LIFE AND PUBLIC SERVICES**

**OF THE**

**HON. ABRAHAM LINCOLN,**

**OF ILLINOIS,**

**REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE FOR THE PRESIDENCY.**

**BY D. W. BARTLETT,**

*Washington Correspondent of the "N. Y. Evening Post" and "Independent."*

**12MO. CLOTH. PRICE, \$1 00.**

**WITH A FINE STEEL PORTRAIT.**

**ALSO,**

**A Cheap Edition of the Same, in Paper Covers,**

**PRICE, TWENTY-FIVE CENTS.**

---

**A GREAT CHANCE FOR AGENTS.**

We want a good Agent in every county in the free States, to engage in the sale of the above work. Send us One Dollar, and we will mail you a sample copy of the book by mail, postage paid, and also a copy of our circular, giving terms to Agents by the quantity.

For Twenty-five cents, in stamps, a copy of the cheap edition will be sent, with terms, &c.

Address all letters to

**H. DAYTON, Publisher,**

**No. 36 HOWARD-ST., NEW-YORK.**

11034